APPENDIX I

Vol. 31, No. 6 February 10, 1972

79TH MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
Chicago, Ill., January 22, 1972

John P. McDonald (University of Connecticut), President of the Association of Research Libraries, opened the 79th ARL meeting on January 22 in Chicago. Following a call to order, an introduction of recently appointed librarians, and the welcoming of guests, Mr. McDonald turned the meeting to Robert Vosper (UCLA), Chairman of the Federal Relations Committee.

Mr. Vosper indicated that he believed that it was incumbent upon ARL to agree on and present position papers on major issues affecting the library community. Views should be made available to Congress, Federal officials, library trustees, interested library staff members, and the general public.

As automation activity is of special concern to ARL, Mr. Vosper saw a need to state long-term goals and aspirations to appropriate persons. He saw a separate and pressing requirement to communicate with the National Commission on Library and Information Science. Communication with NCLIS would be, in effect, public communication.

On behalf of ARL, Robert Vosper asked Neal Harlow (until his recent retirement, Dean of the Graduate Library School at Rutgers University) to reflect upon the requirement to comment on major issues. Dr. Harlow prepared a paper entitled "The Long-Term Objectives of Research Libraries in Respect to Federal Legislation" for the ARL Federal Relations Committee.

The Harlow paper was discussed, revised, and received favorable interest from ARL. It identified three crucial problems. The first was a need "to improve the environment for cooperation among all sectors of the information community (Government, libraries, the academic societies, the information industry, and the universities), particularly among the research libraries." Specifically, it was suggested that a group, or system of research libraries, be developed to assist in the implementation of a unified program. Next, the need to develop a basic information storage concept was identified as vital. A series of "libraries of excellence" was suggested. Third, a national "Periodicals Access Library" (PAL) was recommended. Dr. Harlow suggested that "the collection of journals be comprehensive in categories included; that lending be initially by air mail (eventually by facsimile or other electronic means) and that loans be made directly to organizations with which borrowers are affiliated (including libraries); that the PAL be located near the geographic center of the country (and that the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago be explored as a possible site); that, in planning its operations and services, the British National Lending Library be taken as an example or point of departure; and that, prior to the establishment of PAL, studies be made to anticipate its nature, program, problems, location, timetable, cost, and funding."

On the conclusion of comments by Robert Vosper, ARL members and guests participated in three concurrent discussion groups on the topics, "A Research Library Corporation," "A National Periodicals Resources Center," and "National Centers of Resource Excellence." Following more than two hours of discussion, the general meeting reconvened to hear reports and participate in a general discussion.

Warren J. Haas (Columbia University) led the group in a consideration of "A Research Library Cooperation." He reported that three elements were identified: resource development, the bibliographic process of identifying locally held information, and the ability to provide service to libraries and individuals. He pointed out that the mechanism for resource development was not clear. Because no one library could or should assume responsibility, he saw a need for collective development. The National libraries were charged with continuing responsibility in the bibliographic area and an obvious obligation to provide local service. Mr. Haas concluded by stating that the corporation idea had received widely varying support from those participating in his session.

Rutherford D. Rogers (Yale University) reported on the centers-of-excellence discussion. He pointed out that the group considered various options of access to library materials. For example, an improved interlibrary loan program, the strengthening of the Library of Congress, and the creation of a single center were considered separately and collectively. All were discarded as single, complete answers. He

stressed that the group agreed that there should be a multiplicity of collections, that adequate bibliographic control should utilize appropriate new technologies and communication systems, that (selected centers) throughout the country would need substantial Federal support; and that the Government should recognize how much institutions had already spent in acquiring, housing, and servicing the collections that had made them centers of excellence.

Joseph E. Jeffs (Georgetown University) commented upon the periodical resources center (PRC) proposition. He defined the PRC as "a national facility established to collect in depth and lend with speed periodicals in determined subject fields." Mr. Jeffs noted that the group under his direction raised questions about structure and organization, collections, services, and funding. Special attention was directed to the point of selectivity versus comprehensiveness.

An extensive discussion followed. John Lorenz (Library of Congress) stated the requirement that "a capacity for collective action be demonstrated" and that a "willingness to come together might be well received" by NCLIS and appropriate prospective funding sources.

Business Meeting and Committee Reports

A business meeting was held during the afternoon. Following the election of board members and a report of the membership committee, several other committee and commission reports were heard.

The Interlibrary Loan Committee announced that a report noting volume of service and pertinent costs had been completed and is ready for publication by the Greenwood Press. The report, to be issued this month, contains data for planning and proposals for future studies.

The Committee on Negro Academic Libraries has developed a close working relationship with the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI) Negro library group. Attention has been directed toward management, space planning, staff development, and communications. "Twinning" is being considered as an appropriate action; an example of "twinning" between Temple University and Lincoln University was described by the ARL representative from Temple.

The Development of Resources Commission reported cognizance of five ARL committees. The Organization of Resources and Access Commissions commented upon preliminary organizational efforts, as did the management group.

Mr. Rogers spoke for the Commission on Access to Resources and distributed a prepared paper. He noted that the charge from ARL was "to assist research library users by improving access to information, through a concern for activity and programs of local, regional, national, or international application, and covering all types of library materials." Further, he noted that the group "presently selects the broad area of interface as deserving top priority for its attention. It tentatively has divided this field into six components:

1. Interlibrary loan (including photocopy in lieu of loan)
2. Access to manuscripts (including time and use limitations)
3. Access to large data banks
4. Access to auxiliary or deposit collections (including weeding and protocols of acceptance)
5. Interinstitutional reciprocity and service to external users (including direct access, guidelines for reasonableness of limitations, and use of contractual reliance, royalties, fees)
6. Library-to-Library services, i.e., networking
   a. management aspects: system organization, control of routing, legal issues, cost/fee issues
   b. delivery systems: communication devices such as TWX, telefacsimile, cable TV, communication satellites."

Mr. Rogers stated that "preliminary work can be done on the first four parts; however, a master plan should evolve from further consideration of parts 5 and 6. To this the Commission on Access to Resources will next address itself."

Stephen A. McCarthy, Executive Director of ARL, and John McDonald presented comprehensive summaries of activities during the past months. Current work in preservation, microform technology, microform management, and general management were discussed. Legislative concerns were mentioned and the National Serials Pilot Project was commented upon.

The ARL program meeting will be held in Atlanta in April.

John G. Lorenz, Deputy Librarian, Mrs. Elizabeth E. Hamer, Assistant Librarian, and F. Kurt Cylke, Executive Secretary of the Federal Library Committee, attended the Chicago meeting.

APPENDIX II

Vol. 31, No. 6 February 10, 1972

ALA MIDWINTER MEETING
Chicago, Ill., January 23-29, 1972

COUNCIL I

The first session of council convened at 10 a.m. on January 25 with ALA President Keith Doms (Free Library of Philadelphia) presiding. After the adoption of procedural rules, the agenda for the session, and the approval of the minutes of the sessions held in Dallas last summer, Mr. Doms reported briefly on a number of matters of interest to Council. The subcommittee of the Executive Board engaged in seeking a successor to Executive Director David Clift is making good progress; announcement of an appointment may be expected between late April and the Annual Conference in Chicago in June. Headquarters fiscal retrenchment has resulted in deferring salary increases and upward reclassification and in a limited freeze on filling vacancies. Federal appropriations for library programs are up over 50 percent this year. Mr. Doms, who met with the newly formed National Commission for Libraries in November, looked forward to great benefits to librarianship from the existence of this new commission.

Joseph H. Reason, President of the Association of College and Research Libraries, presented the ACRL recommendation that Peter Doiron, ousted former editor of *Choice*, be paid retroactive salary until the completion of findings in his case by the Staff Committee on Mediations, Arbitration, and Inquiry (SCMAI) and that his former position not be filled until such time. Council approved the recommendation after rejecting an amendment to make the retroactive pay dependent on a favorable finding in the case.

Mrs. Susanna Alexander (Missouri State Library), Chairman of the ALA Nominating Committee, presented the committee's nominees for President-Elect: Harold Goldstein (School of Library Science, Florida State University) and Jean E. Lowrie (School of Librarianship, Western Michigan University); and for Treasurer: William Chait (Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library) and Frank B. Sessa (Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh). More than 50 names were read which were placed in nomination for Council by petition in addition to the slate produced by the Council Nominating Committee and published in the December issue of *American Libraries*. The name of Eric Moon (Scarecrow Press) was added by petition to the slate of nominees to the Executive Board. William D. Murphy, Chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, presented certain amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws implementing previous Council decisions. These were approved on first reading.

The last major item on the amended agenda was the report of the Library of Congress Inquiry Team appointed by the Staff Committee on Mediation, Arbitration, and Inquiry. The Chairman of the team, David Kaser (Cornell University Libraries), read the report which was distributed to Council at that point. Discussion brought out the points that problems of achieving equity in race relations are problems of all libraries, not just of the Library of Congress and that the report of the team gave insufficient stress to the constraints on the Library administration which prevented the presentation of any evidence other than that of the complainants. A Library of Congress staff member related her inability to find out where the team was conducting its inquiry so that she could testify. The motion to approve the report and its recommendations was carried without dissenting vote. (A Library of Congress statement on the report appeared in the LC *Information Bulletin* for February 3, pp. 46-47.)

COUNCIL II

The second session of Council was one of the quietest in recent memory. A. P. Marshall (Eastern Michigan University Library), Vice President, presided, opening the proceedings by introducing Alex P. Allain (St. Mary Parish Library, Louisiana), President of the Board of Trustees of the Freedom to Read Foundation, who reported on the work of the Foundation during the last six months. The Foundation is building a base for future action by laying plans for challenging laws and judicial decisions that restrict freedom to read. During this period the Foundation was actively concerned with two lawsuits, one involv-

ing the banning of a book and the other with the removal of a book.

Katherine Laich (School of Library Science, University of Southern California), Chairman of the Appointments Committee, announced appointments to the Nominating Committee. The Legislation Committee's report was presented by the Chairman, Joseph F. Shubert (State Library of Ohio). The new Legislation Assembly, consisting of representatives of the 14 divisions, has been formed and held two meetings at Midwinter. Immediate major legislative concerns of the committee and the association are the extension of the Higher Education Act, the provisions for library programs in the President's 1973 budget, the President's revenue sharing for education proposal, and the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act. There is a continuing need for additional staff in the Washington Office for the promotion of the association's interests in these and other matters.

On behalf of the committee, Mr. Shubert moved and Council approved a resolution for the appointment of an ad hoc committee to organize a Meet-Your-Congressman Luncheon to be held at the Midwinter Meeting next year. Edmon Low (School of Library Science, University of Michigan), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Copyright, reported on his committee's work and the status of legislation in this field and moved Council's approval of specific wording for recommended inclusion in the Copyright Revision Bill (S. 644) for the protection of libraries and librarians when they reproduce copyrighted material for readers. Council approved.

Contributions by State library associations for the support of the Washington Office followed. Robert R. McClarren (North Suburban Library Systems, Illinois), Treasurer, reported on the somber state of association finances. Income from dues has remained steady despite a membership drop to 28,996, but this and other income fall short of expenses with the result that cash reserves and endowment funds have had to be tapped during the past year. At this unpropitious moment, the California Library Association's request of Council to implement ALA's present priorities by expanding the staff of the Office of Intellectual Freedom and by funding the Office of Minority Recruitment was presented by Harry M. Rowe, Jr. (Orange County Public Library). Council turned it down in a voice vote.

At the close of the session, Council adopted a position statement promising ALA support for the Right to Read Program of the Office of Education and the National Reading Council and an endorsement of the principle of the need for the availability of at least 20 percent of cable television's capacity on a free basis for local, non-commercial educational and public service use. [*C. Sumner Spalding*]

COUNCIL III

The third and final session of the ALA Council for the 1972 Midwinter Meeting convened at 10 a.m. on Friday, with President Doms in the chair. Several new items were admitted to the formal agenda. They included Action Reports No. 13 (resolution for request that the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics make a statistical study of the profession of librarianship), No. 14 (an interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights that would aid in resisting censorship), No. 15 (a revision of the Freedom to Read statement), No. 16 (concerning the Beacon Press), and No. 17 (from the Committee on Organization). All of these items had received the endorsement of the ALA Executive Board.

After announcing that the Awards Committee had withdrawn its request for time during this session, David Clift ALA Executive Secretary, reminded Council that applications for the J. Morris Jones-World Book Encyclopedia-ALA Goals awards would be due within two weeks from the close of the Midwinter Meeting. The year 1972 marks the 10th anniversary of the awards; the $250,000 given to the association have supported many worthy projects. Representatives of Field Enterprises, donors of the award, were introduced to Council.

Council's attention was then drawn to Information Report No. 3, a telegram received from the Librarian of Congress in response to the ALA adoption of the Library of Congress Inquiry Team. (See LC *Information Bulletin* for February 3, pp. 46-47.)

It was announced that following Peter Doiron's formal request for action by the ALA Staff Committee on Mediation, Arbitration and Inquiry, a fact-finding team had been appointed. Its members are Richard H. Donahugh, Youngstown and Mahoning County Library, Gerald Shields, ALA; and Myrl Ricking, Washington, D.C., Chairman. SCMAI members to be concerned with the case will be Mrs. Ruth Frame and Mrs. Judith Krug.

David Clift, reporting on ALA's Program of Action for Mediation, Arbitration and Inquiry that was established in Dallas, said that most of the 128 cases considered have related to conditions of employment, many in academic institutions. One-fourth of the cases have been withdrawn or settled without formal

procedures, four are being held because of pending litigation, inquiry has been completed in two cases, and others are presently under study.

Council turned next to Action Report No. 4, calling for the creation of an ad hoc committee on Equal Opportunity in Libraries. Richard Parsons, Baltimore County, moved that the resolution be adopted, and was seconded by Lester L. Stoffel, Library Administration Division President, subject to an amendment that would have substituted a committee that had already been created by the Personnel Administration Section of LAD for a new ad hoc committee. After discussion, the amendment was defeated and the original motion passed.

Mrs. Helen W. Tuttle, Chairman, presented the report of the Committee on Organization. The first recommendation called for the merger of the Adult Services and Reference Divisions into a single division; the second and third for the creation of two new round tables, a Federal Librarians Round Table and a Round Table on Government Documents; and a fourth recommendation broadened the duties of the Council Nominating Committee to include the additional duty of appointing all Committees of Council. Council would elect the four members of the Committee from eight candidates named by the Vice President and any others that might be nominated by Councilors from the floor. The chairman and fifth member of the Committee would be the Vice President. Procedural guidelines for the appointment of committees and sub-committees of Council were included in the proposals, along with provision for needed constitutional and transitional measures. After acceptance of these recommendations, a fifth recommendation, outlining the responsibility of the Standards Committee with specific detail, generated considerable debate. Concern was expressed for safeguarding the authority of specific divisions to draw up standards for matters within their areas of responsibility, for relations of the committee to the American National Standards Institute, and over the scope, content, and date of coverage of the procedure manual, now in preparation by the Committee, for all standards issued by ALA or its component units. Following reassurance that the manual was meant to coordinate efforts rather than to usurp control of substantive matters, a motion to postpone action was defeated and the measure was adopted. The final and sixth provision recommended organizational implementation of Action Report No. 4 by authorizing appointment of an ad hoc ALA Committee on Equal Opportunity in Libraries for a term of two years, with a membership of five; this measure was unanimously adopted.

Richard Darling, Chairman of the Intellectual Freedom Committee, mentioned recent cases involving denial of access to information on the basis of age and the implications of the roles played by committees of teachers and others who wish to determine or limit what students should be permitted to read. He first presented Action Report No. 14, "How Libraries can Resist Censorship; An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights." A motion to postpone action was defeated and the Committee's statement was adopted.

Mr. Darling then presented a revised Freedom to Read statement in Action Report No. 15, which was meant to broaden the scope of the statement to apply to non-book materials and to more types of libraries. Requests were made for more time for consideration of the documents by Alphonse Trezza, Illinois State Library; Evelyn Levy, Enoch Pratt Free Library; and Genevieve Casey, Wayne State University. A formal motion to postpone was defeated after it became clear that the intent was to clarify rather than to make extensive changes in a document that had the prior approval of librarians and booksellers. After several corrective changes were made in the text in order to strengthen the statement of position on freedom of access to information, the report was adopted.

The Intellectual Freedom Committee's resolution relating to Beacon Press, Action Report No. 16, was then placed before Council. It affirmed ALA's concern over actions taken by the Government against Beacon Press, reaffirmed "the right of a free press in a democratic society," and called for submission of this reaffirmation to Beacon Press and its owners and the reporting of the action to the U.S. Attorney General and to the news media. The report was adopted.

Mr. Darling ended with a cautionary note against the use of weeding collections as a cover for the removal of challenged materials and stated that the matter would probably be brought to Council in June. As weeding can be interpreted as the act of removing harmful materials, perhaps a better term should be developed for the selective removal of items from a library's collections.

Helen M. Brown, of COPES, reported that that body was recommending to the Executive Board that an Office for Minority Recruiting be established, to be funded by $145,000 obtained through the Library Services and Construction Act, through the cooperation of the Illinois State Library, and an additional

but much smaller support from ALA funds.

Council then turned to Action Report No. 12, presented again by Chester B. Ostrander, President of the American Library Trustees Association. The report contained a resolution calling for a White House Conference on Libraries in the year 1974, to be based upon State and Territorial conferences involving "lay . . . and library leadership from . . . libraries of all types." The resolution, which had been endorsed by the Executive Board, was adopted with a slight modification which indicated that the association as a whole supported the resolution.

The election by Council of two new Executive Board members, Richard M. Dougherty, University of California at Berkeley, and Roberta E. Young, Colorado State Office of Library Services, was announced.

It was reported that in response to Action Report No. 8, in which William R. Eshelman, H. W. Wilson Company, and E. J. Josey, New York State Library, had requested a study of the new policy on allotting space in the professional exhibit area, the Executive Board had appointed an ad hoc committee consisting of Augusta Baker, Evelyn Levy, and Robert McClarren to study the matter.

Action Report No. 13, a resolution moved by Mrs. Patricia Schuman, School Library Journal, and seconded by James F. Holly, Evergreen State College, called upon ALA to request that the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics institute a nationwide statistical study of librarianship that would provide information on the profession with reference to the distribution by sex, race, age, and length of employment for all levels within the profession. After the motion had been passed, Mrs. Ruth Frame, LAD Executive Secretary, reported that the Bureau of Labor Statistics was contemplating such a survey and would send ALA a copy of its proposed questionnaire for further suggestions although it might not be possible to collect all of the specific data requested in the resolution.

In his closing words, President Doms assured the New Jersey and California Library Associations that their expressions of concern would not be taken lightly, even though it had been impossible to satisfy all programs of high priority. He proposed an Affirmative Action Program within ALA.

David Clift reported the names of several additional nominees to be added to the Council ballot. In response to a proposal by Samuel L. Simon, Long Beach Public Library, that pertinent policy statements and copies of meeting agenda should be made available to observers attending open meetings, he stated that this was not always feasible but suggested that a single copy could be posted and, that insofar as possible, copies would be made available to observers. Mr. Clift's final report was that the registration for the Midwinter Meeting had reached 2,480.

[*Mrs. Mary Ellis Kahler*]

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

At the request of the Federal Library Committee, Russell Shank, Chairman of the FLC Task Force on Education, testified before the Committee on Accreditation (COA) of ALA at a January 24 meeting. Dr. Shank's comments related to suggestions for change in the Tentative Draft of Revised Standards for Accreditation as developed by COA.

The formal statement from FLC was primarily directed toward "general" terminology used in the tentative draft and the lack of attention to the possibilities of change. The statement presented on behalf of the Federal Library Committee read:

> Employers of library school graduates have a stake in the quality of library school education. Employers must seek graduates who are not only prepared to perform on their first jobs, but who also have the vision and expertise to become "change agents" for the future. The Federal Library Committee recognizes that not only our profession, but also the entire educational community is in the process of reexamination and change. The statement in the proposed ALA Standards which describes the Standards not as "blueprints" but rather as "maps," encouraging "initiative, experimentation and individual differences" must therefore be commended. The extremely general terms in which both the Standards and the sources of evidence are described, however, does introduce some doubt about the effectiveness of the Standards in fulfilling its stated goals of protecting the public and providing guidance to educators. In addition, the general nature of the proposed Standards places a heavy burden upon the individual judgments of the members of visiting teams.
>
> The proposed Standards indicate that "indispensable components of good library education" have been identified; these components should be more clearly and rigorously explicated where they exist. The quality of library school faculty, for example, is an area in which at least minimum criteria may be defined. The number of full-time faculty, the ratio of full to part-time faculty, the ratio of faculty to students, and the areas of faculty expertise could be more clearly set forth within the context of program objectives.
>
> If librarianship does indeed possess (as the proposed Statement describes) "a body of knowledge and skills which makes its program distinct," the elements which comprise this body of knowledge and skills should be outlined. The

range of content areas for program objectives can, in this context, be made more specific and the sources of evidence more clearly defined.

To a large extent, the proposed ALA Standards reflect that Norman Burns described in a Seminar on Validation of Accrediting Standards held on October 27, 1971 in Washington, D.C., as standards "... based on the assumption that if an institution possesses certain structural characteristics which are generally recognized as good, the probabilities are high that good education will take place." As noted above, the proposed ALA Standards in many instances has not been specific enough about these structural characteristics. COA should consider, however, what Burns has called "a new approach" to accreditation. These new directions are a result of changes now taking place in the nature of the educational experience. According to Burns, accreditation will focus not upon the structural elements of a program, but upon the outcomes of the educational experience. Accreditation should then be a process of evaluating a school's potential to achieve goals of expected outcomes of educational experience.

In addition, Burns stresses the necessity for what he calls "a planning dimension" in the educational program. It seems especially relevant that librarianship include among its Standards a strong element of planning. That is, library schools should demonstrate that they have provided in their programs the planning capacity to insure both the continuing effectiveness of the educational experience as well as the modification of educational activities in light of emerging and changing professional and educational needs.

Finally, Burns notes the inherent value of a thorough self study prior to the visit by accreditation teams. The periodic process of self study by the schools will aid in clarifying objectives and in the planning process.

Before the "new approach" to accreditation can be implemented, however, methodologies for assessment of outcomes must be developed and members of the schools and of the visiting teams must acquire "new skills and understandings." COA can, however, encourage the development of such methodologies and skills. The requirement of a thorough self study need not await the development of new methodologies and skills and should be included as a component of Accreditation.

In summary, the Federal Library Committee encourages COA to adopt and specify more precisely those standards and sources of evidence in areas where agreement exists within the profession. In addition, the Committee on Accreditation should encourage the exploration of new developments in accreditation and attempt to insure that the Standards and methods of accreditation remain responsive to change.

No discussion followed the presentation.

[*Frank Kurt Cylke*]

AFLS

The Board of Directors of the Armed Forces Librarians Section (AFLS) met on January 26. Robert W. Severance, President, conducted the business meeting at which three items of particular interest were discussed.

First, it was agreed that the booth planned for the ALA Annual Conference in June would have an international motif. The exhibit will identify military libraries throughout the world and provide descriptive materials. Employment opportunities and appropriate personnel contact points will be identified.

Mr. Severance noted activity concerning the proposed Federal Librarians Round Table (FLIRT). [FLIRT was approved by Council as an official roundtable on Friday, January 28.] He outlined activity which had occurred since the last ALA Conference. Of special significance was the January 25 meeting of the ALA Committee on Organization (COO) at which Mr. Severance and Frank Kurt Cylke, Executive Secretary of the Federal Library Committee, presented arguments for establishment of FLIRT. It was stressed that COO had received comments at an "information meeting" and would act at a later date. The number of Federal librarians—approximately 4,000—was cited as a professional group not fully participating in ALA program activity. Indeed, of approximately 2,500 military librarians, only 260 belong to AFLS. Other points were also made in response to specific questions from COO.

Mr. Severance stressed that, when acting in regard to FLIRT, he did not do so as President of AFLS but as a "separate self-appointed responsibility." He stated that, "if and when FLIRT is established, AFLS can consider the possibility of transferring in."

Before a lengthy discussion, it was decided that information about AFLS would be disseminated in newsletters issued by the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Federal Library Committee, and the revived Public Library Association publication. [*Frank Kurt Cylke*]

ACLO

Ronald F. Miller, Program Director of the New England Library Information Network and President of the Association of Cooperative Library Organizations (ACLO), presided over the business and program meetings of ACLO on Monday, January 24. Mr. Miller briefly reviewed activity since the June 1971 ACLO meeting and introduced Phoebe F. Hayes, Secretary-Treasurer. Following acceptance of a report by Miss Hayes, who is attempting to build member-

ship, the president opened the two-part program meeting.

Carlos A. Cuadra, System Development Corporation (SDC), commented upon "Present Programs and Future Guidelines for Academic Consortia." The report described work funded by the U.S. Office of Education through Title II-B of the Higher Education Act.

Approximately 20 months ago, USOE asked SDC to identify academic consortia that are "doing something" and, then, to make an in-depth study of specific consortia. A questionnaire was sent to 2,600 colleges and universities; more than 1,500 responses were received, of which approximately 700 indicated activity. Of these, 409 individual institutions participated in consortia. A second questionnaire was sent to the 409 institutions and resulted in the return of 173 questionnaires. The 173 responses were examined using USOE criteria: autonomy; separate identity; academic libraries in the majority; activities beyond interlibrary loan; operational or in the planning stage; and voluntary in nature.

One hundred and twenty-five consortia were identified. An in-depth analysis was conducted of 15 consortia, which were visited by a team from SDC. One day was spent at headquarters and two days with member libraries. Interviews ranged from one to four hours. Seventy individuals were contacted on 58 separate interview trips.

Carlos Cuadra noted that all those contacted were cooperative and candid regarding problem areas and areas requiring attention.

A summary of findings was well received and prompted a lively discussion. It was noted that consortia activities included reciprocal borrowing privileges, expanded interlibrary loan, union catalogs and lists, photo copying, and broadened reference services. All are "low cost, fast action, low compromise" activities.

Financial data were provided by 47 respondents. Less than 50 percent operated on less than $75,000 each year and 40 percent had no budget. Sources of funds were identified by 61 respondents: internal, 42 percent; service fees from libraries, 10 percent; service fees from individuals served, two percent; gifts, three percent; Federal, State and municipal, 28 percent; non-government grants, one percent; and other, 17 percent. Of the 61 respondents, 54 did not have formal budgets.

One-third of the consortia used computers. Only two provided a separate, "unique" computer capability.

In regard to staffing it was found that directors, assistant directors, librarians, system analysts, and secretaries were employed.

Evaluation techniques were also examined. Six types were identified: informal feedback from library personnel, informal feedback from individuals, analysis of cost and use, formal surveys of operations, operations research, and formal surveys of ultimate users.

It was noted that 78 percent of all consortia were established since 1966. Thirteen percent were established between 1961 and 1965, with four percent initiated between 1951-1960. The earliest example of an academic consortium was cited as being established in 1931.

In conclusion four phases of consortia operations were cited: exploratory, planning, development, and operation/evaluation.

Three reports were generated by SDC. It is anticipated that all will be available for use within four months: "Study of Academic Library Consortia: Final Report; Phase II" (TM-4597/004/60); "Guidelines for the Development of Academic Library Consortia" (TM-4597/005/00); "Directory of Academic Library Consortia." The "Directory" holds name, state, and activity indexes. There is also a list of non-academic consortia and a selected bibliography. Of special interest is a section describing pertinent consortium activities, union catalogs and lists, cooperative development of resources, sharing resources in terms of use, communication, centralized processing, cooperatively sponsored planning and surveys, cooperative storage, and cooperative computer centers.

C. Donald Cook, Council of Ontario Universities, and Darrell Lemke, Consortium of Universities, next joined Ronald Miller in a discussion of "Cooperative Acquisitions Policies."

Mr. Cook noted possible benefits resulting from cooperative acquisitions programs such as economy, richer resources, more comprehensive coverage, and a better knowledge of locations. Further, he cited four levels of cooperative acquisitions or sharing.

Seven problem areas were identified. They included (1) identifying and locating data, (2) necessity to reach consensus, (3) cooperation from clientele, (4) responsibility to primary clientele, (5) legal and financial, (6) homogenous vs. heterogenous groups—variations in size, and (7) the ability to produce. He concluded his remarks by stating that areas for cooperative acquisitions include subject, type, and type and frequency of use.

The Council of Ontario Universities is currently dividing graduate program responsibility, exchanging information on major purchases, and developing a fund from which collections may be purchased.

Darrell Lemke cited the need of "pressure and force from a clearly defined power base" to effect action. He also stated that a good information system must back up any activity.

Ronald Miller closed the meeting following a general discussion. He requested that those wishing to join ACLO should contact Phoebe F. Hayes, Bibliographical Center for Research, 1357 Broadway, Denver, Colo., 80203. Dues for active membership are $5 per year, with those for sustaining members listed at $10 a year. [*Frank Kurt Cylke*]